In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy.

On the four *pādas* of Śaivāgamas

by Hélène BRUNNER, C.N.R.S., Paris

I. General belief about the Āgamas having four parts

It is quite usual to find, under the signature of authors dealing wih āgamic literature, the unreserved statement that the Śaivāgamas (henceforth Āgamas) are made of four sections (*pādas*), or an implicit acceptance of the same. Though the whole of this literature is not yet available, and probably never will be, it seems that āgamic studies have now progressed sufficiently[1] to allow us to question this contention. We have already initiated the work in some previous studies of ours[2] ; but as our remarks were incidental, and are dispersed in various papers, mostly written in French, the need to deal more systematically with the question remains. The present paper is conceived as a first step in this direction : without launching ourselves in a thorough enquiry, we shall simply bring together the relevant facts which are known to us.

The four sections involved are : *vidyā* or *jñāna* (doctrine, philosophy)[3], *yoga*, *kriyā* (ritual), and *caryā* (discipline, or rules of behaviour) -- this according to the so-called "descending" order, dear to the Tamil school of Śaiva-Siddhanta[4]. The representatives of this school are indeed among the writers who most heavily insist on the above subdivision of the Āgamas, for they consider the four types of corresponding teachings (starting from *caryā*) to be successive steps towards the ultimate goal, which is liberation (*mokṣa*), supposedly given by *jñāna*. Such is the opinion voiced for instance by Devasenapathi, following Tamil masters of the XVIth century[5] ; and many other authors of the same school could be cited, who have expressed the same view. Though it would be possible to maintain this thesis without alluding precisely to definite sections of the Āgamas, but only to different subjects of teaching, this is not what is generally done : a fourfold division of the texts is commonly presupposed. There is no doubt that this opinion has influenced modern authors dealing with Śaivism, especially those who were unfamiliar with, or totally ignorant of, the Āgamas, while they had access to the works of Tamil Śaiva-Siddhāntins ; hence the repeated statements -- some of them accompanied with a measure of warning that the

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

reality may be different from the theory -- that the Āgamas comprise four sections[6].

Now that we see a little clearer in these obtruse writings, can we still consider this statement as valid ?

II. Enquiry into the Āgamas

The only way to answer the question is to look into the Āgamas themselves. What actually are their contents and organization ? What do they say on the subject ? Is the presence of four *pādas* synonymous with greater perfection ? And what about the texts which are not so divided ?

A) Present condition of the texts

1. Their structure.

Among the Āgamas which have come down to us, only four distribute their teachings into the four traditional *pādas* : two Mūlāgamas (out of twenty-eight), the *Kiraṇa* and the *Suprabheda*, and two Upāgamas (out of two hundred or so given by our lists), the *Mṛgendra* and the *Mataṅgapārameśvara* . All the four are published. No other Āgama or Upāgama, among the unpublished ones, is so divided. There are signs to show that the original *Pauṣkara*, which is lost (the *vidyāpāda* published under this name may not be authentic) had four *pādas* also, though the ancient quotations bear mostly on ritual[7] ; N.R. Bhatt thinks that the same may be told of the Upāgama called *Sarvajñānottara*[8] ; and we personally feel, on the strength of one verse (unfortunately corrupted) of the *Raurava*, that this Mūlāgama also might, in its original form, have possessed four sections[9]. The huge majority of the extant texts consists in an undivided mass of teachings, concerning mainly, though not exclusively, ritual (that is, *kriyā* in the ordinary sense). A few of them are provided with a *vidyāpāda* -- for instance the *Raurava*, the *vidyāpāda* of which however goes by a special name, *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, is credited to a "speaker" different from the one who teaches the *Raurava* proper, and contains notions which clash with the ritual expounded in the latter and may well belong to a more primitive layer[10]. Some others have come to us in the form of isolated *vidyāpādas*, like the *Vātulaśuddha*, of doubtful antiquity.

How is this situation to be explained with regard to the traditional affirmation of the division of the Āgamas into four parts ? It would be of course naive to rely solely on the present condition of our texts in deciding their original structure : much of the āgamic literature has been lost, and it is perfectly possible that some Āgamas, now reduced to mere fagments, displayed a perfect and logical quadripartition in their original form . More :

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

it is clear to any person familiar with these texts that many of them, even among the best known, have suffered repeated alterations, to the point of a complete rewriting in some cases[11] ; and one may suppose that the sections considered less important by the "rewriter" of a given treatise were simply dropped in this process. All these possibilities, and many others that we leave to the readers' imagination, must be present to the mind, so that the hypothesis up to now preferred by scholars who know something about the Āgamas -- that these Śaiva Scriptures were all complete in the beginning, and the almost regular absence of *vidyāpāda*, *yogapāda* and *caryāpāda* is only the result of losses of material -- be left open at the start.

But this idealist hypothesis, which proceeds from a total confidence in traditional declarations that no one had the time or the desire to investigate, testifies to no less naive an attitude than that which would take into account only the present form of the texts. We intend to show that there is a third way out of the present dilemna, and we offer this as our own hypothesis, which simply reverses the preceding one : most of the Āgamas which constitute the canon of Sanskrit Śaiva-Siddhānta were never subdivided into the four parts enumerated above ; and if some of them do present this quadripartition, it is the result of later modifications.

Let us for the time being pursue our enquiry by examining more closely the texts which present themselves as "complete".

2. Organization of the matter in the texts presenting four *pādas*.

A quick glance on the table of contents of the four Āgamas in question[12] is enough to show : (1) that they do not follow a single model in the succession of the *pādas*; (2) that the two Mūlāgamas totally disagree in the distribution of the different rituals within the four *pādas*.

The first observation is of secondary importance and could be left out, were not the Tamil list, which implies a definite hierarchy, present to the mind of most readers. We shall therefore give the sequence of the four *pādas* in the texts we have : *kriyā*, *caryā*, *yoga*, *jñāna* in the *Suprabheda* ; *vidyā*, *kriyā*, *caryā*, *yoga* in the *Kiraṇa* ; *vidyā*, *kriyā*, *yoga*, *caryā* in the *Mṛgendra* and *Mataṅgapārameśvara*. Nowhere do we find the tamil list (either in the descending" order or the reverse) ; and nowhere is there even the suggestion that there could be a hierarchy between the different teachings -- a point on which we shall come back.

The second observation will take us nearer to our discussion; for, were the quadripartition of the subject-matter a traditional one, one could expect a minimum of agreement between the texts on the definition of their four sections. What we find is different : if the *vidyāpādas* teach approximately the same subjects (ontology, epistemology, eschatology)[13], and the teachings concerning *yoga* do appear in the *yogapādas*, the greatest disorder reigns in

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

the matter of the rituals : the *Suprabheda* includes in its *kriyāpāda* all the rituals connected with establishment of images, construction of temples, etc., and places in its *caryāpāda* those concerning the personal life of the devotees (*dīkṣā*, etc.) ; the *Kiraṇa* does the opposite ; and besides, it describes in the *yogapāda* the ceremonies connected with the death, as well as the "lifting of the marks" (the visible and invisible marks of those coming from other sects : *liṅgoddhāra*) -- informations that one would expect to find in the *caryāpāda*. To an unprejudiced reader, this Āgama looks as if a compact mass of teachings, merely divided in chapters more or less logically arranged, had been artificially split into four at a certain stage, without attempt at reorganization[14]. The same cannot be said of the two Upāgamas we have mentioned : in both of them, the *kriyāpāda* contains all the rituals, whatever their form[15] ; the *caryāpāda* is really concerned with the rules of behaviour of all the disciples, and the special duties of each category[16] ; and the *yogapāda* deals solely with *yoga* . Now, it is important to remember that the first two works belong to the fundamental set of texts (Mūlāgamas) and are concerned with rituals connected with temples, while the other two are listed among the secondary texts (Upāgamas)[17], and deal with private ritual only[18]. This remark will be useful later.

B) Explicit declarations of the texts.

Our search through the Āgamas for statements concerning the fundamental division of these texts into four parts has yielded a very meagre harvest.

1. It is only in the *Kāmika* that we have met this statement in general terms[19] ; and since we have good reasons to suspect the antiquity of this famous text in its present form[20], we may suspect the statement as well.

2. The *Mṛgendra* declares this quadripartition, but it speaks of itself only[21] ; and when the *Matangapārameśvara* alludes to the four *pādas* in describing the qualifications of a good *ācārya* (he must be expert in the four sections)[22], one must also understand that the reference is to the stucture and teachings of this Āgama alone, considered as self-sufficient[23]. The same holds true for the parallel passage of the *Suprabheda*, in the very same context of *ācāryalakṣaṇa*[24].

3. We must mention separately a passage of the *Suprabheda*, which occurs in its chapter on the "descent of Scriptures" (*Tantrāvatārapaṭala*). The account closely follows the common pattern, with this interesting detail : when we reach *Suprabheda* itself (it is the last of the first ten Āgamas, which constitute the group called *Śivabheda*), we read that this text is called "suprabheda" (= "of a good variety" ? or "having

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

good division" ?) on account of its alone showing clearly [the four sections], "from *kriyā* to *jñāna*"[25]. Actually, this chapter mentions the presence of four sections in connection with no other Āgama, including *Kiraṇa*. After pointing out that, in any Āgama, the chapter on *Tantrāvatāra* is necessarily older than the rest (since it gives the full list of Āgamas, and generally also of Upāgamas, and therefore presupposes the completion of the corpus), we see three ways of justifying the above statement. One could say that, at the time when this chapter was included in the treatise, most of the Āgamas had already lost two or three of their sections, so that to have preserved them all was a matter for boasting for the *Suprabheda* -- which clearly believes it is the only one to be so "complete". Even if we could accept this unlikely hypothesis, the task would remain to find a good explanation for twenty-seven Āgamas having so early been so badly neglected. Another way to deal with the difficulty is to maintain that the two relevant lines have been added, for some reason, at a much later stage -- a matter which could probably be decided by looking into all the extant manuscripts. The third way out, actually supported by the considerations which will be found further down, is simply to accept that the Āgamas were generally not divided into four parts, and that the *Suprabheda* was well aware of its originality on this point. The second and third possibilities are naturally not mutually exclusive : our text may have, at a certain time, given itself a previously non-existant quadripartition, and have accordingly altered its chapter on the "descent" of Śaiva Scriptures. We shall come back later on the *Suprabheda*, and express the poor opinion we have on this text.

But merely from the above observations, taken together, one can safely conclude that the texts provided with four *pādas* were indeed the minority long before the present time. Some informations gathered from various works support this view. We read for instance, in Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary of the *Kiraṇa* (dating from the Xth or XIth century), that one calls "*saṃhitā*" a text where the four *pādas* are clearly distinguished[26] ; and on the other hand, several commentators give occasionnally a list of texts called *saṃhitās*, where we do find almost all those whom we know to possess four *pādas*[27]. There is no reason, apart from our own prejudices, not to put the two informations side by side and conclude that, at the time of Rāmakaṇṭha at least, the quadripartition of Śaivāgamas was by no means a general feature. It is even possible to go further back, since Tirumūlar, whose date is certainly not lower than the VIIth century, speaks of the Āgamas as being divided into three parts : *karman*, *upāsana* and *jñāna* -- an evidence which shows at least, and whatever the precise meaning of *upāsana* in this context, that the division into four parts was not then a general feature of Āgamas[28] .

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In order to complete this picture, it would be necessary now to take into account the passages of the non-āgamic literature which unequivocally declare that the Āgamas (or Tantras) are composed of four sections. We shall however leave this task to others, with nevertheless a warning that the relevant passages must be taken into consideration only if one can show that they have not been interpolated in the works they are now found, under the influence of a common but unwarranted belief that the Āgamas must be so divided. The testimony of some Purāṇas (like Agni, etc.), which have absorbed a lot of āgamic teaching, is especially weak ; and the same could be said of many other writings as well.

So, formal considerations already cast serious doubts on the veracity of the statement we are concerned with. A closer examination of the āgamic teachings will help clarifying the problem.

C) Interconnection between the different types of teachings

1. Respective role of the four *pādas*

We have already mentioned that no hierarchy among the different *pādas* is recognized, or even suggested, in the texts which possess them all. The general opinion, rarely voiced by the Āgamas themselves, but everywhere implicit, and made explicit by the commentators, is that all four *pādas* are to be taken as a whole, for they sustain each other : no initiated Śaiva can perform his ritual without the knowledge of the categories involved ; and this ritual would have no fruit without a strict discipline, and a certain practice of *yoga*[29]. Apart from a few exceptions, our texts hold the ritual to be the core of the religious life, and see accordingly the three other types of teachings (whether or not they are found in separate *pādas*) as subservient to *kriyā*[30]. The *jñānapāda*, as already noted, sets forth the doctrine and not the "higher knowledge" -- the latter being inseparable from *mokṣa*, which is obtained by the great initiation (*nirvāṇadīkṣā*) and actualized by a life of sustained effort, where ritual predominates, but all the āgamic teachings find their proper place. *Yoga* is ignored by some texts, but insisted upon by those which have most influenced the school ; and its importance lies in its being integrated in the ritual, rather than in its presenting a specific path. When the texts speak of *karmins*, *yogins* and *jñānins*, we have accordingly to understand these vocables as merely indicative of the aspect of the *sādhana* on which the stress is placed. As for *caryā*, it poses no problem ; we must only repeat that the Āgamas never suggest that this discipline could constitute a path (*mārga*) in itself[31]. A big part of the *caryāpādas* actually concerns the special duties of the different initiates, and would therefore have no

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

meaning, if divorced from the *kriyāpāda*, where as a rule the different *dīkṣās* and *abhiṣekas* are taught.

2. Agreement between the four *pādas*

If such is the common view about the use to be made of the different teachings, there should be a total agreement between the instructions contained in the four *pādas* of a given text. As we have dealt with this question in recent papers[32], we shall only give the result of our enquiry : the agreement is good in the *Mataṅgapārameśvara* ; it is rather good in the *Mṛgendra* where, if the *vidyāpāda* fails to explain all the notions which are implied by the ritual, and the details on *yoga* given in the *yogapāda* have not all an evident ritual usage, there is at least no patent contradiction between one section and another. The situation is different for the two other texts. In the *Kiraṇa* , the main problem concerns the apparently abnormal distribution of the teachings between the *pādas* (see above) ; but another one is posed by the section on *yoga* , which, in contradiction with the common āgamic position, presents itself as an independent way to Śiva, and has little bearing on the rituals described in the *kriyāpāda* and *caryāpāda*. In the *Suprabheda*, the *jñānapāda* deals with some notions which have no use in the ritual as described by this text, and come clearly from other Āgamas, while the *yogapāda* contains some doctrinal teachings which, not only are misplaced there, but disagree both with the philosophy of the *jñānapāda* and with the instructions of the *kriyāpāda*. One is forcibly led to the conclusion that the treatise which goes by that name has been composed out of heterogenous fragments drawn from various sources -- a conclusion which is corroborated by the absence of ancient quotations of this text, by the fact that many passages of the *Suprabheda* are identical with parallel passages of other Āgamas, and by the mention in this work of social categories unknown by ancient texts[33]. This does not mean that all the informations contained there are worthless ; it shows only that we have a further reason, besides those given above, not to rely too much, in the discussion of our problem, on this Mūlāgama being divided into four parts.

D) Situation in the undivided texts

We have shown that the presence of four *pādas* in a given Āgama was no guarantee that the teachings of this text were satisfactory, that is, both complete and coherent. We are now going to show that the opposite situation is not hopeless : an undivided text may be a very good treatise, lacking nothing essential.

1. The first thing to be noted is that undividedness does not mean total absence of the teachings which one would expect to find (on

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

account of the well-rooted belief that there should be four *pādas*) in a *vidyā-* , *yoga-* or *caryāpāda*. Sometimes, they are given in the form of whole chapters, which are logically situated in the work, for instance the description of the "six paths" (*ṣaḍadhvan*) just before that of the *dīkṣā* which makes use of them[34], or the precise account of the worlds (*bhuvanas*) on the same occasion[35]. More often, they appear in the form of group of verses usually inserted within a ritual description at the moment they are needed : instructions about the yogic exercise which constitutes the prononciation of the *bīja* of Śiva, just before the rite (usually, a phase of the *dīkṣā*) where the right utterance of this *mantra* is of special importance ; statement of the rules to be observed by an initiate, immediately after the description of the *dīkṣā* (*samayadīkṣā*)[36] which opens the regular life of a Śaiva ; details on the observance (*vrata*) which necessarily precedes, or follows, such or such consecration (for instance *ācāryābhiṣeka*), on the occasion of this ritual ; and so on. A regular feature of our texts is the presence, at the beginning of the work (or of the *kriyāpāda* when there are two or more sections), of a separate chapter giving instructions about the "extraction" of *mantras* (*mantroddhāra*) ; and the specification, in form of *dhyānaślokas*, of the traditional aspects of the important divinities, at the moment the evocations of these Gods and Goddesses are enjoined. One generally feels that everything one needs to know in order to perform the rites correctly (and this includes the mental visions and inner understanding) is there[37]. Or let us more cautiously say that the want of some indications is as frequent in the texts supposed to be "complete" than in the others. And the latter have a further superiority : the occasional instructions they provide are usually safer than those that we find in the the *vidyāpādas* and *yogapādas* of the others -- for instance of the *Suprabheda* .

2. Another point which should not be missed, but which we cannot develop in a short paper, is that the practice is often transparent to the theory. It often happens that the informations derived from a "reading through" of the rites are the most precious elements we have for understanding the development of the doctrine, which certainly was not uniform at the start, and was fixed only in a late stage[38]. In a similar way, the analysis of a *yoga-* permeated rite will yield more indications on the exact place of *yoga* in the religious life of a Śaiva than the study of a *yogapāda*, which often follows a model alien to the spirit of the ritual section -- this being, as we have said, the essential of āgamic teachings.

3. A last remark, of formal nature : we do not find in the undivided texts any allusion to the sections which are generally supposed

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

to be missing, while we find, in the *Mṛgendra* for instance, a precise allusion to the three other *pādas* in the first one, that is the *vidyāpāda*[39].

III. Conclusions

We hope that the survey which precedes, though short, has convincingly demonstrated that our hypothesis regarding the absence of any quadripartition in most of the extant Āgamas is well-grounded. It must now be stated more precisely :

1. In our view, the majority of Āgamas, especially those dealing with the temple cult[40], consisted originally each in a continuous series of *paṭalas*, arranged according to a logical sequence, but not distributed into four sections[41]. They dealt mainly with rituals, but were interspersed with passages -- eventually whole chapters -- which gave the necessary informations of doctrinal, yogic or disciplinary nature. That this presentation is normal can be shown indirectly : this is the one we find in the most famous Tantras of the Kashmir school, like *Svacchanda* or *Mālinīvijaya*[42], whose kinship with the Saiddhāntikāgamas cannot be denied, in spite of the fact that, being concerned with individual *sādhanas* only, they are closest in contents to the Upāgamas we shall next deal with .

2. Around the VIIIth century or perhaps earlier[43], we see the appearance of some texts which classify their teachings according to four heads, and hence present four different sections, convincingly distinguished and arranged. Probably composed within "monastic" communities (*maṭhas*, headed by *ācāryas*) and for their own use, these texts deal exclusively with personal *sādhanas*[44], know a more sophisticated form of cult, and insist on *yoga* as an element of ritual. If we can judge by the two which have reached us, *Mṛgendra* and *Matangapārameśvara* (but we assume there were others), they were the works of scholars, well-informed on the āgamic literature, expert in the various branches of learning and more philosophically minded than the compilers of the more ancient Āgamas ; but these learned *ācāryas* did not lack an ethical and spiritual dimension either. When the composition of the āgamic corpus took its definite form, these texts were included in the category of Upāgamas[45], and apparently lost much of their weight in the course of time.

3. Whether under the influence of these Upāgamas, or of the early *paddhatis*, like that of Somaśambhu, which drew heavily from them, or else of other works, there occurred at a later (but uncertain) date a modification of the extant Āgamas, the effects of which can be easily perceived : the appearance of new notions, sometimes clashing with the more ancient ones (which are not cancelled), and of new techniques, usually given as alternative procedures ; introduction in the temple ritual of a

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ṛoga-oriented cult, which had till then characterised the private cult of the *sādhakas* ; and many others alterations, naturally conceived as improvements, most of which do not interest our enquiry[46]. As for the changes we are concerned with, that is, the introduction of four sections in some already extant Mūlāgamas and in newly composed ones, we may assume that it was carried out in connection with the preceding modifications, noting however that the model presented by Vaiṣṇava Scriptures, where the fourfold division seems to genuinely characterize some texts devoted to temple-worship[47], perhaps played in this case the essential role[48]. The texts which were so subdivided naturally appeared to be the best ; and the new assertion that Śaivāgamas were composed of four *pādas* made its appearance and gained ground, as a part of a more general attempt to valorize these Scriptures, all the more revered as they were slowly neglected and ignored -- an ignorance without which no such claim could have ever been possible.

It is interesting to note that some *paddhatis* followed suit. Somaśambu's (XIth cent.) and Aghoraśiva's (XIIth cent.) are undivided[49], as well as Viśvanātha's *Siddhāntaśekhara*[50] (probably XIIth cent. also) -- these three having no other ambition than to be good ritual handbooks. The four "traditional" parts appear in Trilocana's *Siddhāntasārāvali* (XIIIth cent.), while *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* presents four parts too, though differently conceived[51]. It looks as if having four parts was then viewed as a certificate of worth.

Such are the conclusions that an already long familiarity with the Āgamas have led us to. It is quite possible that they be refused by scholars better informed than us, or invalidated by future discoveries. Let them at least serve as an instigation towards further research in a much too much neglected field.

We are pleased to present this study to Dr. Janaki, as a tribute to her learning and to the efforts she has made since many years to promote the knowledge of āgamic literature.

ABBREVIATIONS and BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Sanskrit Texts :

Aj I : *Ajitāgama*, éd. crit. par N.R. Bhatt, Publ. IFI N°24, vol.I, 1964.

AP : *Aghoraśivācāryapaddhati* (= *Kriyākramadyotikā*), with the commentary (*Prabhā*) by Nirmalamaṇi, Cidambaram 1927 ; *gr.*

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ĪśgP : *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, 4 vol, new ed., Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi/Varanasi, 1988.

Kir : *Kiraṇāgama*, Devakoṭṭai, 1932 ; *gr*.

MatP : *Matangapārameśvarāgama*, avec le comm. de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, éd. crit. par N.R. Bhatt : vol.I (*vp*), Publ. IFI N°56, 1977 ; vol.II (*kp*, *vp*, *cp*), Publ. IFI N°65, 1982.

Mṛg I : *Mṛgendrāgama*, *vp* and *vp*, with *vṛtti* by Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha and *dīpikā* by Aghoraśivācārya, Devakoṭṭai, 1928.

Mṛg II: *Mṛgendrāgama*, *kp* et *cp*, avec la *vṛtti* de Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, éd. crit. par N.R. Bhatt, Publ. IFI N°23, 1962.

: *Id*., trad., intr. et notes par Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, Publ. IFI N°69, 1985.

PKām: *Pūrvakāmikāgama*, new ed., Madras, 1975.

Rau : *Rauravāgama*, éd. crit. par N.R. Bhatt, Publ. IFI N°18, 3 vol.,1961, 1972, 1988.

RauU: *Rauravottarāgama*, éd. crit. par N.R. Bhatt, Publ.IFI N°66, 1983.

SārK : *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama*, avec le comm. de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, éd. crit. par N.R. Bhatt, Publ. IFI N°61,1979.

SiSār : *Siddhāntasārāvali*, by Trilocanaśivācārya, with a comm. by Anantaśambhu, Bull. of the Government Oriental Manuscript Library, N°XVII to XX, Madras, 1965 to 1972.

SP3 : *Somaśambhupaddhati*, éd.'et trad. par Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, Publ. IFI N°25, 3° vol.,1977.

Su : *Suprabhedāgama*, Madras, 1928 ; *gr*.

TĀ : *The Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta*, with comm. by Rājānaka Jayaratha, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, 12 Vol., 1918 to 1938.

N.B. : *kp*, *cp*, *vp*, *vp*= *kriyā-*, *caryā-*, *yoga-*, *vidyāpāda*
gr = *grantha* script
Fr., Skt = French, Sanskrit
Publ.IFI = Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry

Studies by the present author referred to in the notes :

Brunner 1965 : "Analyse du *Kiraṇāgama*", *Journal Asiatique*, Paris, p.309-328.

1967 : "Analyse du *Suprabhedāgama*", *Journal Asiatique*, Paris, p.31-60.

1988 : "L'*ācārya* śivaïte : du *guru* au *gurukkaḷ*", *Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes* N°6, Paris, p.145-176.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

1990a : "Ātmārthapūjā versus Parārthapūjā in the Śaiva Tradition", in *The Brahmanic Tradition and Tantrism*, T. Goudriaan edr., Brill, Leiden, 1990, p.4-23.

1990b : " Jñāna and Kriyā -- Relation between Theory and Practice in the Śaivāgamas", in Felicitation Volume to A. Padoux ; awaiting publication.

1990c : Review of Saskia C. Kersenboom-Story's *Nityasumaṅgalī*, in *Indo-Iranian Journal* N°33, p.121-142.

1991 : Place of *yoga* in Śaivāgamas, in preparation.

See also *Mṛg* II and SP3.

---

1 Any scholar interested in Śaivism knows that, during the past decades, a considerable improvement of our knowledge in this field was made possible by the French Institute of Indology in Pondicherry. At the instigation of Professor Jean Filliozat, and thanks to the sustained efforts of pandit N.R. Bhatt, a vast programme of collection and copy of āgamic manuscripts, of edition and translation of texts was started, resulting in the bringing to light of many important Āgamas, which, not so long ago, were believed to be lost. Others, not yet published, are now easily available there in manuscript or transcript form. Dr. S.S. Janaki, in honour of whom the present book is published, was one of the first persons in India to fully understand the importance of this new field of research.

2 Lately : Brunner, 1990b, I, B, 2.

3 The interpretation "higher knowledge" (see Gonda, *Med. Rel. Lit.*, p.3 -- ref. in n.6) does not correspond to the actual content of this section in the works which have it.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

[4] We must seize this opportunity to repeat once more that the term "Śaiva-Siddhānta" is used in the Āgamas themselves to indicate the school of Śaivism they belong to, and that there was an already long tradition of [Śaiva-] Siddhānta (commonly referred to by this name by the Kashmir masters) in Sanskrit, before the Tamil school was born. Hence the necessity to specify the school one is talking about by adding an adjective. The latter should not however be understood in a retrictive sense : we know that many a representative of the "Tamil" school produced Sanskrit works as well.

[5] V.A. Devasenapathi, *Śaiva Siddhānta*, University of Madras, 1966, p.246 : "The Siddhāntin says that human beings [...] have to pass through the stages of caryā, kriyā and yoga before they attain jñāna whereby they reach Śiva." See also p.250, where the same author states the view of Jñānaprakāśar, who associates the four sections with four different "paths" (*mārgas*) and four different achievements (*sālokya*, *sāmīpya*, etc.).

[6] See K.C. Pandey, *Bhāskarī*, vol.III, Lucknow University, 1954, p.VII ; C.G. Diehl, *Instrument and Purpose*, Lund 1956, pp. 48-49 (quoting first Farquhar, then giving precisions by drawing from a fake *Kāmikāgama*, written and published in Kumbhakonam at the end of the XIXth cent. -- on which see details in Brunner, 1990c, pp.130-131) , then pp. 50-51, where doubts about this subdivision being general are expressed ; K. Sivaraman , *Śaivism in Philosophical Perspective*, Motilal Banarsidass, 1973, pp. 33, 386, 387 ; Gonda, *Les Religions de l'Inde 2*, Payot, Paris, 2nd ed.1985, pp. 50-51 (speaking of Tantras in general) ; Gonda, *Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit*, Wiesbaden, 1977, p.3 (with some precautions) ; V.V. Dvivedi, "The utility of Tantras in modern times", in *The Sanskrit Tradition and Tantrism*, T. Goudriaan ed[r]., Brill, 1990, [pp.32-42], p.32. For an early statement of the actual conditions of the texts, see Bhatt's Intr. to *Ajś* I, pp. x-xi.

[7] N.R. Bhatt seems to suggest (see *MatP* II, Skt Intr., pp. lxxxii-lxxxiii, but more clearly in the Fr. Intr., p. xi) that fragments of the lost three *pādas* are actually known. He also remarks that the quotations from *Pau* in Rāmakaṇṭha's comm. on *MatP* are not traceable, including those which could belong to a *vidyāpāda*. Out of the ten he lists in the App. p.485, we have found one only (from p.173) which answers this condition, dealing as it does with a well-known group of nine *tattvas*. The last line however enjoins a *nyāsa*, and it is more likely that the fragment belongs to the description of a ritual. The other nine quotations bear directly on ritual. This naturally proves nothing about an original quadripartition of the text, though the absence of quotations from the known *vidyāpāda* -- or any *vp* as well -- would rather point to an original absence of divisions. In any case, it comforts us in the

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

opinion we have already expressed (Brunner, 1990b, n.128) that what has been printed as the *ṛp* of *Pau*, and was commented upon by Umāpati in the XIVth cent., does not belong to the original Āgama of this name.

8 See Bhatt's Skt Intr. to *RauU*, p.1 -- the French Intr. (p.vi) is not reliable on this point. One must however note that there are no *pāda* divisions in what may be the oldest extant manuscript of the *Sarvajñānottara* : a Nepalese palm-leaf ms. (NAK MS 1/1692 "*Sarvajñānottaratantra*") which probably dates back from the begining of the Xth cent.
We owe this last information to Dr Alexis Sanderson (A.S.), of Oxford, an authority in matters of Tantrism, whom we thank heartily for his help. He not only accepted to read our paper and improve its English, but he made several substantial remarks, the essence of which will be found incorporated (with due recognition of our debt) in our notes.

9 See *Rau*, *ṛp*, 1, 4, where we find : *vijñāna*, *yāga* (= *kriyā*), *saṃskāra* (prob. for *caryā*) and *yoga*, mentioned as the subjects to be taught in the work. (The verse has the form of a question from the disciple, but it is well known that such questions generally give the contents of the work.)

10 A ms. which announces itself as the *ṛp* of the *Kāmika* exists in the IFI collections. It has not been thoroughly examined, but at first sight has nothing to do with what we know as *Kāmika*.

11 See Brunner,1990b, IV, 1 for details.

12 Two of them, *Kir* and *Su* are not easily available. Analysis and (Skt) lists of contents in Brunner, 1965 and 1967.

13 This is not to say that they teach the same doctrine. See Brunner 1990b, I, B, 3.

14 An unexpected confirmation of this intuition of ours came after this passage had been written : A.S. mentioned to us the existence of a Nepalese manuscript of the *Kiraṇa* , dated Nepālasaṃvat 44 (= AD 924/5), which does not show any *pāda* divisions.

15 It seems however that the ritual of *pratiṣṭhā* was dealt with by the *Mṛg* in its *cp* , though the few verses of this chapter which have been preserved (see Bhatt's edition, App.I) are now in the form of an isolated fragment. Let us remark that, in the works which deal with private ritual only (*ātmārthapūjā*), the *pratiṣṭhā* may be viewed as a special aspect of the behaviour of the *sādhaka* -- whose *sādhana* may demand the establishing of a *liṅga* : see *ibid.* and Brunner, 1990a, p.6 -- , and therefore be dealt with in the *cp*. In the works concerned with *parārthapūjā*, it should logically belong to the *kp*.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

16 The disctinction is according to grade (*samaya-in*, *putraka*, *sādhaka*, *ācārya*), or to circumstances (one is for instance *vratin* or *avratin*). See *Mṛg* II, *cp. Varṇas* and *āśramas* are referred to mainly in late works.

17 We use a cautious formulation, for there is no certainty that all the Upāgamas are later than, and dependent of, the Mūlāgamas.

18 This is no to say that all Upāgamas restrict their teachings to *ātmārthapūjā* . There are several instances of the contrary.

19 *PKām*, 1, 108b, speaking of Siddhānta Tantras : *catuṣpāda-yutān=eva*.

20 See our transl. of *Mṛg* II , pp. xvi-xviii.

21 *Mṛg*, *vp*, 2, 2 : *tripadārthaṃ catuṣpādaṃ mahātantraṃ jagadpatiḥ / sūtreṇaikena saṅgṛhya* ...-- a passage sometimes mistakenly quoted as applying to Āgamas in general.

22 *MatP*, *kp*,10, 2 : *catuṣpādārtha-kuśalam...* ; and 5, 3b-4a, which gives more details by enumerating (in the order in which they appear in the text) the *pādas* which have to be mastered.

23 As theoretically each Āgama should be. See Brunner, 1988, p.152 and 1990a, p.19.

24 *Su*, *kp*, 21, 6b-7 (speaking of the *ācārya*) :

kriyādijñānaparyanta-śāstreṣu kṛtaniścayaḥ //
kriyāpāde tu nipuṇaḥ caryāpādānuvartakaḥ /
yogapāde kriyābhyāso jñānapādānurañjakaḥ // (note that the order of the *pādas* in these veses again reproduces their order of succession in the text).

25 *Su*, *kp*, 2, 27 :

kriyādi-jñānaparyantam atraiveha pradṛśyate /
idaṃ śāstram anenaiva suprabhedam iti smṛtam // We have already twice called attention to this passage (Brunner : 1967, p.34 and 1990b, n.35).

26 *tathā kiraṇa-vākhyāne rāmakaṇṭhācāryeṇāpy= uktam* :

pādānāṃ pravibhāgena caturdhā nāmadheyataḥ /
siddhaḥ pradṛśyate yasmin saṃhitā sābhidhīyate //

The source is a XVIth cent. handbook called *Dīkṣādarśa* (IFI, T.76, p.21). The same gives also, as coming from *Rau*, the following line :

saṃhitā syāc catuṣpādayuktā kāmikapūrvikā / (see also *Rau*, vol.III, p.337, line 17), where the last word, if authentic, would give a precious indication on the original *Kāmika*. The conception of a *saṃhitā* is however variable and the question should be more closely investigated. One may for instance hesitate about the meaning of this word in *TĀ*, 15, 467a (a passage pointed to us by A.S.), where Abhinavagupta says that an *ācārya* should be

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

catuṣpādsaṃhitābhijñaḥ, just before stating that he should know (also ?) the 18 and 10 Tantras, i.e. most probably the 28 Āgamas of the Siddhānta.

27 Thus, Nirmalamaṇi, commenting on *AP*, p.369, has a list of seven : *Mṛgendra*, *Mataṅga*, *Parākhya*, *Raurava*, two *Svāyambhuvas* and *Kiraṇa*. The two *Svāyambhuvas* must be *Svāyambhuva* proper and *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva* ; but their mention presents a problem, for the extant mss. show no subdivision, without appearing for this to have been amputated. For the *Raurava*, see n.9. The absence of *Suprabheda* is to be noted, as well as the mixture of so-called Mūlāgamas and Upāgamas.

28 See C.V. Narayana Ayyar, *Origin and early History of Śaivism in South India*, University of Madras, 1974, p.249. The three terms may be synonyms for *kriyā*, *caryā* and *jñāna* (*yoga* being absent) -- or rather, as A.S. suggests on good grounds, of *kriyā*, *yoga* and *jñāna* (*caryā* missing). If the text really speaks of material divisions, the information is worthy in any case and shows that an enquiry into the Tamil literature could yield interesting results concerning our special problem. As an isolated evidence, we do not see how it could be further exploited.

29 See for instance the intr. by Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha to the *yp* and to the *cp* of the *Mṛgendra*. Actually, the stress on *yoga* seems to be absent from the oldest texts, so that we are left with three kinds of teachings only. See Brunner, 1991.

30 On the relation between *jñāna* and *kriyā* , see Brunner 1990b ; on the place of *yoga*, see Brunner 1991.

31 One cannot adduce as a counter proof the following verses from the *Kiraṇa* (*yp*, 6, 7-8) :

ye yathā saṃsthitāḥ tārkṣya tathaiveśāḥ prasādakṛt /
kecid cātra kriyāyogyās teṣāṃ muktis tathaiva hi //
jñānayogyās tathā cānye caryāyogyās tathāpare /
evaṃ yeṣāṃ yathā prokto mokṣas teneśayojanāt //

(the last line as per M.P. Vivanti's ed., Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1975). For these verses, which are quoted (with some variants) by Jayaratha in his commentary of *TĀ*, 15, 18, do not allude to *pādas* at all, but to different capacities of the souls : some of them are fit for the performance of rituals, others for doctrinal study, others for disciplinary practices (*vrata* instead of *caryā* in verse 6b). And what the passage teaches is that, after the *dīkṣā* (referred to as *saṃskāra* in 4b), which is the real cause for liberation, the initiate should bring about the effect of the rite -- that is, *mukti* -- by resorting to the activity he or she is more fitted. The lines directly following (they are absent from Devakottai's ed. but are given in some mss. and

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

appear in M.P. Vivanti's ed. -- where one must only correct *dīkṣaṇaiva vimokṣas syāt* into *dīkṣaṇaiva vimokṣas syāt*) confirm this interpretation, which is also that of the commentator, Rāmakaṇṭha.

[32] See n.30.

[33] See Brunner, 1990b, IV, 1.

[34] These *adhvans* are the "ways" along which the guru may lead the soul of the disciple during the drastic purification called *dīkṣā* (*nirvāṇadīkṣā* : see *SP3*, ch.III to V). He chooses naturally only one of them.

[35] Exactly, when the texts describes the form of *nirvāṇadīkṣā* called *bhuvanadīkṣā* ; for in this ritual the guru, when leading the soul to Śiva, passes through all the worlds successively, so that the soul may eat up all the *karman* which is in store there. See *ibid*.

[36] Or the second part of it, called *viśeṣadīkṣā*, when this is recognized as a separate *dīkṣā*. See *SP3*, Intr. and ch.II.

[37] Impression for instance derived from the *SārK* (published) and the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* (to be published in a near future). This of course does not mean that oral instructions from the guru, supplementing those of the books, could be dispensed with ; but this need is no less urgent for the apparently "complete" works.

[38] See Brunner, 1990b, I, B, 3 and III, 7.

[39] *Mṛg*, *vp*, 2, 8 -- a detail which alone should have sufficed to prevent Farqhar (criticized by Diehl on other grounds, *op.cit.*, p.47 and n.2, but unfortunately repeated by Das Gupta, *A History of Indian Philsophy*, vol.V, p.18) putting forward the hypothesis that the *Mṛgendra* (then known only from its *vidyāpāda* and *yogapāda*), was the "first section" of the *Kāmika*. See Brunner, 1990b, n.40 for instances of similar references in *MatP*.

[40] This is not to say that all the Āgamas concerned with temple cult are older than the others -- there is no way of deciding about this issue. But some of them definitely contain archaic elements, and may be viewed as representing the first layer of āgamic literature.

[41] We would not say, with Raffaela Torella ("Sārdhatriśatikālottara" , in *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, vol.L (1976), [pp. 279-318], p. 280) that the shorter texts have a tendency to mix together the four traditional parts -- we hold that these parts did not exist in the original form of the texts (short or long) in question.

[42] A.S. adds : *Picumata* (= *Brahmayāmala*), *Jayadratha-yāmala*, *Tantrasadbhāva* and *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

[43] *Mṛg* and *MatP* were quoted by Abhinavagupta in the Xth cent., and commented in the Xth or XIth cent. They do not seem however to belong to the most ancient layer of āgamic literature.

[44] Especially those which involve a total dedication. The initiate technically called *sādhaka* is given a prominent place (see our transl. of *Mṛg* II, pp.xl-xli and N.R. Bhatt, *MatP* II , Skt Intr., pp.cxvi-xcvii), a feature which is to be connected with the characteristic stress on *yoga*.

[45] A fact in contradiction with the importance which was attached to these works by ancient authors. One may infer from it a change of outlook in the Śaiva circles, which resulted in an upgrading of the texts concerned with temple ritual, and a simultaneously downgrading of the others. See our transl. of *Mṛg* II, pp. x-xix.

[46] On this point, and the very possibility to alter Scriptures whose authorship is claimed to be Śiva's, see Brunner, 1990 b, IV, 1.

[47] Gonda, *Med. Rel. Lit.*, ch.VI (p.98, 100, 103) describes three of the Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās -- two of which concerned with temples -- as possessing the four traditional parts, announced earlier also (p.3, n.7) as a feature of the *Viṣṇu-S*. We do not know whether this quadripartition would stand a critical analysis .

[48] Buddhist influence could also be thought of, since the classification of Buddhist Tantras (*kriyā-*, *caryā-*, *yoga-* and *anuttara-*) parallels that of our *pādas*. There are however two formal differences : in case of Buddhist Tantrism, texts, and not sections of one text, are so characterized ; and the sequence of the four terms is a fixed one, while it is variable in the case of our *pādas* . Besides, the term *caryā* has certainly not the same meaning here and there, while Buddhist *anuttara* , which means esoteric and superior knowledge, cannot be simply made a synonym for Śaiva *vidyā* . But such differences are only natural, given the differences of contexts. The main problem is historical : the Buddhist classification is known from a Tibetan work of the XIVth century (see F.D. Lessing and A. Wayman, *Introduction to the Buddhist Tantrik Systems*, reprint Delhi, 1983, pp.1-2), that is to say, much later than the composition of *Mṛg* or *MatP* . But since the author, Buston, refers to earlier authorities, it seems difficult at first sight to decide about the priority of either the Buddhist classification or the one found in our two Śaiva works, and therefore to speak of influence. The opinion of A.S. is however clear on this point. He rejects the possibility of Buddhist influence and maintains that, on the contrary, "the classification of Buddhist Tantras [...] is certainly modelled on the Śaiva typology" (personal communication). A study of his on the question is to be published shortly.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

[49] The subdivision into *nitya-*, *naimittika-* and *kāmya-vidhi* in Devakoṭṭai edition of *Somaśambhupaddhati* is due to the editor : there is no trace of it in the mss.

[50] Here too the editor seems to be reponsible for the introduction of three divisions (the same as in Somaśambhu's case).

[51] This work cannot be dated, but is certainly not very ancient, at least in its present form. Its four parts are named *sāmānya-*, *mantra-*, *kriyā-* and *yogapāda* -- the first two dealing already with ritual matters, and being sometimes at odds with the rest.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy